

1508/639.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

P—L C—LL'S CONDUCT,

WITH REGARD TO THE

R. CATHOLIC BILL, &c.

BY A LADY.

PRINTED IN THE YEAR MDCCLXXXI.



THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

WITH REGARD TO THE

THE CATHOLIC BIBLE

BY A. L. B. B.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

OBSERVATIONS, &c.

IT has been often said, That it is an easy thing to censure. This assertion, however, I deny; since, to a delicate mind, it is ever accompanied with painful feelings; and to one partial to a person or a party, it is difficult almost to an incredibility! We can rail, it is true; we can scold; nay, that last degree of bitterness expressed by the word *scurrility* is common now in the writings of men who are fond of eloquence: but to throw out a well-weighed censure, neither too soft nor too severe, is something I have so seldom seen done, particularly in publications, that I am at times tempted to think it is not intended or approved of by our present class of writers.

Of this we have a very recent example in P——l C——ll in Aberdeen; a man of the smoothest manners, and blessed with talents that, one would think, could turn themselves into any shape, particularly to what

was gentle or formed to please. Him all the world would expect so much humanized, as never at least to offend the ear, but when absolute duty and his serious office forced him to it: yet even *he* does not now attempt to *censure*; but in the same work, almost the same page, where he cites the benign words of JESUS, loses himself in that *scurriosity* that makes every line ineffectual.

And why that gentleman's pen was at present put in motion, I know not; except it was meant to quiet the minds of the vulgar, who had dared to suspect him of a growing partiality to Popery. This indeed he has cleared himself of: but at what expence? That of meriting from every impartial Protestant a just disapprobation; not for arguing against the Popish bill, for that is a mere politic, and a thing difficult for a Protestant to oppose upon Christian principles; but for him to attack any set of men that have law on their side for acting against Papists, at least while he lives in Aberdeen, is to forget his own former conduct; which I suspect the inhabitants will not so easily do. First to mislead his own party, and then most contemptuously accuse them of being wrong, does really seem to me rather too much to go down with any reasonable man.

To make a preacher respectable, besides meekness



meekness in his reproofs, there should be an appearance at least of truth and justice in what he says; and in that case, such a man as Dr. C——ll will always carry his hearers or readers along with him to conviction. But do these qualities appear in Dr C——ll's conduct with regard to the Popish bill? On his first appearance in church after the Edinburgh mob, he gave no marks of affliction that might move the minds of his hearers to serious thoughts. His head was not bowed down; he “wept not betwixt the porch and the altar,” like those who mourned for their own and people's sins in former days. Far from intreating his innocent audience to pray for the crimes of their distracted brethren, who had justly made themselves obnoxious to the vengeance of heaven by an injurious contempt of the laws of their country and an infringement of the public peace, or taking any other gentle method to lead to that fear of God that might make their prayers ardent that they might be kept from the like crimes; he addressed them with the most spirited indignation, as if they had been themselves the guilty people. He pronounced, amidst many invectives, that “they were Papists who acted *so* and *so*,” and whether he meant the *mobbers* only, or intended to join his *hearers* with them,

seemed to many of these a doubt. In either case, to me, who know both what Protestants and Papists are, he was unintelligible: for I cannot perceive the most distant resemblance betwixt either of these parties and *mobbers*, who are people contemptuous of all authority both in church and state; an imputation which has been sometimes laid to the charge of Protestants by their adversaries, but never, that I know of, fell upon Papists, who are reckoned among the strongest abettors of passive obedience. But if Dr C——ll continue to say every thing of Papists that is contradictory and inconsistent, it will not long be more difficult for a Protestant conscience to embrace Popery, than follow *his* Protestantism.

Dr C——ll, in his address to the clergy and people, goes on in the same style; and insists, that all who are against the Roman Catholic bill are *Papists*; without seeming to feel, as a delicate writer, that this is not wit; nor, as a minister of the gospel, that it is not truth. Indeed, if there be no more difference betwixt Protestants and Papists but Dr C——ll's being in good or bad humour, I cannot see why what he had formerly said against the latter should have much weight with the former: Yet I firmly believe that his sermon, preached and printed in the year 1771, upon a *sound mind*,
 was

was the only thing that led the women and the vulgar in Aberdeen to be afraid to do their duty as Protestants, and be in charity with Catholics: and while Papists are entitled to laugh to see that very *name* he then named with marks of contempt, given now to his own people; and the followers of the Pope, and the followers of C——ll, blended together as persecutors; it is not in the power of the best-meaning Protestants to justify such a proceeding.

The panic of the people is sincere. They cannot forget that he once said there was no religion amongst Papists but “rites and ceremonies. Their ideas of baptism and other sacraments, he called the “essence of “superstition;” and hinted, that a much higher degree of perfection had been attained by the Indian devotees of the idol with a thousand names. In ridiculing their frequent ejaculations of JESUS and MARY, he declared, that he knew no difference betwixt them and the worshippers of another country invoking their god *Fo*. Now I would ask any person, who did not know from history, or his own observation, that the Papists are Christians, Whether, upon hearing that sermon, they might not have as readily imagined them the followers of *Mahomet* or *Confucius*, as the followers of CHRIST. This was not, however, all that
Dr

Dr C——ll did then say to irritate the minds of his people against Papists, and to make them tremble at a connection with them.

He was sensible, that it is not in the nature of man to hate the brother he *sees* for any ideal difference in the faith or worship of the God he *sees not*: and therefore, in another part of the same discourse, he applies more directly to the hearts and passions of his hearers; and avers, that lying, deceit, and every kind of vice the most pernicious to society, is practised by Papists, and encouraged by their *clergy*, if it but appear to them that their church may be benefited thereby. He asserts, moreover, that in this same church of Rome indulgencies are bought and sold; that is, by giving money to the priests, one may be absolved of any crime without repentance or amendment;—or that all his sins may be done away at once by a general rare absolution from the Pope.

This, I say, was the astonishing professed opinion Dr C——ll had of Papists in the year 1771: yet these are the very people he desires us now to take into our bosoms; and thinks no objection can be made to the demand, but that “it is a Christian method, and that Christian methods are not the present taste.” I think, however, I could conceive another reason for at least

least a few being against the bill. There were many *women*, and some *men*, that absolutely believed him in earnest in that first sermon, and, for aught I know, gave credit to all he said of the Roman Catholics. Now these, if they have not changed sentiments, cannot, according to nature, sense, or religion, be for that bill, since the first indispensable law of nature is self-preservation, and it cannot be the will of God to support vice or encourage the vicious. Dr C——ll, then, previously to his turning the unexpected advocate of Papists, for whom he had before taught his people an almost unalterable aversion, should have used all the dexterity he is master of, to convince the world he had seen his own mistake; and, from a deep sense of justice and charity, wanted an injured set of men received into our good graces, as the equal servants of JESUS CHRIST with ourselves. In that supposition, not to allow them their way of worship as well as we have ours, is indeed not to be a Protestant.

But to believe what Dr C——ll once advanced from both the pulpit and the press concerning papists, and never since unsaid; and yet to think of unfettering such wretches as he has described them; is what no eloquence of a preacher, or slight of a politician,

cian, can ever make me go into. We have something of greater authority to direct us in so important a matter ; I mean, the pure word of God. If the Papists go against it, I would make no concession to them, come of the honour of our nation what will. For I own I am one of those who are really hurt with Dr C——ll's way of reasoning ; and though I esteem him as an elegant writer, and an eloquent preacher in our national church, I can never excuse his manifest opposition to the sacred Scripture. Almost every line lately published by him goes against that charity he recommends from it : and I would willingly appeal to every one who has read the Gospel and imbibed its spirit, whether when Dr C——ll cites the texts thereof, he does not fall into a style, and breathe a disposition, so different from it, as to make one tremble when JESUS CHRIST is named, lest it should be criminal to think of him without a heart more softened and more sensible to love, than any person could be who had his passions of pride and hatred wrought up with such care by so able a pen.

For if his advice could at all further the passing of the Popish bill, it could only do so by making use of the pride inherent in our nature, to lead Protestants to grant to
the

the
char
aver
ful h
dang
peop
whe
and
a th
indiv
whic
is, t
thing
bear
ever
verfa
this
hear
waro
of cl
S
dispo
up t
CHR
inqu
exce
mor
to o
to fa
cien
Gor

the Papists, not a toleration of justice and charity, but a toleration of contempt and aversion. They are pointed out as a pitiful handful, that cannot in this nation be dangerous, or do much ill; but still as a people bred up in cruel principles, who, wherever they are, mean the worst things; and this accusation, much more severe than a thousand penal laws, is aimed at a few individuals lately oppressed by a mob, to which *mob* Dr C——ll's bitterest reproach is, that they are *Papists*! If this mean any thing, it must mean that the people who bear that name are monsters capable of every wickedness, and a just object of universal contempt and detestation. And if this be the way to move the hearts of hearers or readers to a Gospel charity towards Roman Catholics, I know nothing of charity or the Gospel.

Sure I am, it is perfectly opposite to the disposition of a genuine Protestant, brought up to take into his heart all who believe in CHRIST, without any nice or scrupulous inquiry about their particular tenets. I except, always, the fundamental points of morality, for which we are all accountable to one another: and here, far from daring to say that I have found the Papists deficient; I have often been ashamed before God and my own conscience, when I ob-

served

served their charity to the poor, and tenderness to the souls of men. And a persecuting and uncharitable spirit is so visibly known not to reign amongst Scotch Catholics, that the most violent Protestants, when you push them upon the suggestions thrown out by Dr C——ll in his *Address*, want always to appeal to other times and countries; and, like him, bring in old lawless massacres, or state-policies, which are no more necessarily connected with the Popish than with the Protestant religion, and which none but wild declaimers of either side will lay hold of as a topic of reproach.

I thank God, I class myself with the violent of no party, having been happily born to think for myself, and despise only those who will not see things as they are, nor represent them as they see them. This, to the utmost stretch of my reason, I ever made my rule, whether for or against me. Indeed, that I was brought up a Protestant, seemed always to me a mere chance; and to have thought myself better or more saveable on that account than another set of men, would, in my ideas, have been a sin connected with the blackest pride; and every party-preacher I have through life shunned as one that sported himself with his great function. Dr C——ll's sermon,
how-

how
and
Sav
the
For
was
per
sion
than
piec
was
and
who
is n
felt
liev
her
up
Chr
com
mili
faith
N
than
gosp
" n
" th
" H
" al
" y
" to

however, on a *Sound Mind*, I did attend to; and while I remember the words of our Saviour, *By their fruits you shall know them*, the fruits of that sermon I will never forget. For being stationed at Aberdeen when it was published, I observed it produce more personal animosities, uncharitable expressions, and even real breaches in friendship, than ever I knew occasioned by any other piece. In truth, it is my belief there never was such another preached or published; and I will take upon me to affirm, that whoever runs it over without being shocked, is neither a sincere Protestant, nor a heart-felt Christian. As Protestants, we must believe all creatures equally intitled to charity here, and salvation hereafter, if they act up to their own mode of faith; and as Christians, we must believe and obey every command of JESUS CHRIST with that humility which subjects our weak reason to faith.

Now I know no command more express than in the two last verses of St Matthew's gospel: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo! I am with you always even to the end of the world." This is the

last contract of the Saviour and the Friend of mankind with his creatures, which nothing but a failure on their part can annul: but, then, it must be attended to, that the commission is no sooner given to "*teach,*" than the method is specified, "*baptizing them,*" &c. Now whenever this action is omitted, they have not been employed in teaching *to observe all things* whatsoever he commanded them, and they cannot expect him to be "with them to the end of the world." And, to the end that this precept might not be easily misunderstood or misinterpreted, he vouchsafes to explain in his next gospel more fully, what was commanded in this, (St Mark, 16th chap. and 15th verse.) *Go ye into all the world, preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned.*

By this, I think, it ought to be indisputable among Christians, that there is not a single promise made to any person that is not *baptized*, and *believes* not the *gospel*; of which the fore-cited verses are some of the strongest and plainest lines. And however ridiculous the Papists may appear to Dr C——ll, for their putting a confidence in baptism, and believing it necessary to salvation; it is plain, at least, that they here believe and do what CHRIST commands; and,

and, consequently, may be supposed to have got hold of the *promise*: while to no creature is left the shadow of a promise who thinks as Dr C——ll does in *p.* 69 of his sermon. “To ascribe a virtue to an outward form, unaccompanied with any disposition that can render it significant, I take to be the essence of superstition. It is representing the ordinances of JESUS as nothing better than a magical spell.”

This loose and contemptuous way of mentioning baptism, I think more shocking to reason and the common ideas of mankind, than if he had denied the sacrament altogether, as the Quakers do; from the belief they are in, that our Saviour meant no outward action or pronunciation of words at all, but only an inward baptism of the heart. This is at least to be consistent: but who will say there is any consistency in Dr C——ll’s conduct; who, while to please the vulgar he observes the outward form of baptism even with regard to infants, who have surely no *disposition* in them *that can render it significant*, maintains at the same time that there is no virtue in it? Dr C——ll, for fear of popular odium, baptizes the children of his hearers, “In the name of “the Father, and of the Son, and of the “Holy Ghost:” but, to shew his aversion to Popery, declares it is the very essence of

superstition to ascribe any virtue or efficacy to that ceremony. I confess, I was long a great admirer of Dr C——ll; but from the moment I read the above quotation, I have ever entertained a strong suspicion that he does not believe in CHRIST. The assertion is harsh, I own; but I cannot help it. It is by no means so harsh as to suppose, that he does believe in CHRIST, and yet disregards his command, and vilifies his ordinance! he does more; he calls in question his Godhead.—For to allow that CHRIST gave an order for all men to be baptized, and to an obedience to that order annexed all the influence of his grace; and yet to think that it is not necessary to obey that order, or that no virtue nor grace is conveyed by obeying it, is to think that CHRIST wanted either the authority to make the command, or the power to execute the promise annexed to it: and in neither of these cases could he be GOD; nay, nor an envoy sent from GOD with power adequate to the purpose of his divine mission.

How Dr C——ll's hearers could seriously approve and applaud such a sermon, is a question I will not take upon me to determine: for my part, if I were to hear any preacher whatever talk of baptism as he does, though I had been used to consider him as the most learned divine in the church,

I should from that moment consider him as one that gave up fairly the divinity of **JESUS CHRIST**, and doubted of the efficacy of his promises.

It has been said in Dr C——ll's defence, that he spoke only the sentiments of his church. Were that the case, I would not hesitate to affirm, that his church must be a very wavering and unsteady church, unfixed in her principles, and uncertain in her determinations. His church, 50 years ago, taught a very different doctrine. But, though I doubt not there may be in the church of Scotland several even of her clergy whose sentiments with regard to **JESUS CHRIST** and his sacraments are nearly the same with Dr C——ll's, I am satisfied that the greater part of his brethren, and almost all the people, are of a contrary opinion: and I have never yet seen a presbyterian, man or woman, who would venture to profess publicly the Doctor's sentiment of baptism, much less to approve the uncharitable manner in which he treats Catholics.

And here, indeed, I allow that his greatest admirers pretend not to excuse him any other way, than by saying, That he was not sufficiently acquainted with the Catholic tenets; and therefore not chargeable with voluntary misrepresentations.

superstition to ascribe any virtue or efficacy to that ceremony. I confess, I was long a great admirer of Dr C——ll; but from the moment I read the above quotation, I have ever entertained a strong suspicion that he does not believe in CHRIST. The assertion is harsh, I own; but I cannot help it. It is by no means so harsh as to suppose, that he does believe in CHRIST, and yet disregards his command, and vilifies his ordinance! he does more; he calls in question his Godhead.—For to allow that CHRIST gave an order for all men to be baptized, and to an obedience to that order annexed all the influence of his grace; and yet to think that it is not necessary to obey that order, or that no virtue nor grace is conveyed by obeying it, is to think that CHRIST wanted either the authority to make the command, or the power to execute the promise annexed to it: and in neither of these cases could he be GOD; nay, nor an envoy sent from GOD with power adequate to the purpose of his divine mission.

How Dr C——ll's hearers could seriously approve and applaud such a sermon, is a question I will not take upon me to determine: for my part, if I were to hear any preacher whatever talk of baptism as he does, though I had been used to consider him as the most learned divine in the church,

I should from that moment consider him as one that gave up fairly the divinity of JESUS CHRIST, and doubted of the efficacy of his promises.

It has been said in Dr C——ll's defence, that he spoke only the sentiments of his church. Were that the case, I would not hesitate to affirm, that his church must be a very wavering and unsteady church, unfixed in her principles, and uncertain in her determinations. His church, 50 years ago, taught a very different doctrine. But, though I doubt not there may be in the church of Scotland several even of her clergy whose sentiments with regard to JESUS CHRIST and his sacraments are nearly the same with Dr C——ll's, I am satisfied that the greater part of his brethren, and almost all the people, are of a contrary opinion: and I have never yet seen a presbyterian, man or woman, who would venture to profess publicly the Doctor's sentiment of baptism, much less to approve the uncharitable manner in which he treats Catholics.

And here, indeed, I allow that his greatest admirers pretend not to excuse him any other way, than by saying, That he was not sufficiently acquainted with the Catholic tenets; and therefore not chargeable with voluntary misrepresentations.

This may be some alleviation of the Doctor's conduct; but by no means a sufficient apology. If he was not, he should have made himself acquainted with the Catholic tenets before he pronounced of them; especially as he was to pronounce a sentence of condemnation, which could not fail to render them highly obnoxious to his audience. In fact, were I to hear and believe of any set of creatures, what he in different parts of his pieces affirms of the Papists, my feelings, which were not certainly given me in vain, would be the same in the company of one of that persuasion, as in that of a robber or murderer. But if ever I happened to be undeceived, and to find that my credulity had been abused; I could not help despising the man who had inspired me with false ideas of my neighbour, and wounded my charity at his expence.

If any one had reason to be pleased with Dr C——ll's doctrine, it was undoubtedly the Deist. To him, indeed, it could not fail to be agreeable. A single blow aimed at Revelation from a professed clergyman, is more dangerous to it, than all the united attacks of a Voltaire or a Rousseau. To my certain knowledge, his sermon was considered in that light by some of our free-thinkers; who, though in certain companies

panies they might join with the good ladies in its praise as an excellent performance, made no scruple, when they were in the tavern, to laugh at it as an impotent attempt to expose the Popish religion; and to consider the author as the sure, though secret, friend of their own party.

But perhaps the Doctor, in the course of five years, had opportunities of knowing the Roman Catholics, and their tenets, better than he did at the time he wrote that sermon; and now, from motives of justice as well as charity, has published his Address, as a tacit retraction of what he had too rashly advanced? Were this really the case, his moderation and ingenuity were greatly to be applauded: but will any one who has read his pamphlet, take upon him to affirm that this is in any degree the scope of it? Analyze the whole of his reasoning, and you shall find it all reducible to these two propositions. "The Papists, it is true, are a rascally pernicious set: but they are, in this country, far beneath the notice of Protestants. We owe them no indulgence on their own account, but we would dishonour ourselves by persecuting them."

If it be asked, What good reason can be assigned for Principal C——ll's wishing to have a bill passed in favour of a people whom

whom he paints in such hideous colours; I can think of none but this. It had been considered as a necessary, or at least an expedient piece of policy, at this critical juncture, to diminish the Jacobite party as much as possible. The R. Catholics had often declared that their religious, not their political principles, were an obstacle to their allegiance: they declared themselves ready to swear fealty to the king, if permitted the free exercise of their worship. A shadow of liberty, (for it was only a shadow), was no sooner offered them, than they grasped at it with eagerness. In the eyes of the poor unsuspecting Papists, it was a boon they could not repay with too much gratitude: but in the views of the politicians, who formed or furthered the scheme, it was meant as an artful expedient to accomplish one day their total overthrow. "They have borne adversity with patience; and their numbers, it is said, are increased: but let them once taste a little of prosperity, and we shall soon see them dwindle away to nothing." The reasoning, I believe, was just: the expedient, perhaps, would have been effectual; but the conduct of those who adopted it, was certainly inconsistent.

Not so that of the *Committee* and their Associates. They declare themselves the avowed

vowed enemies of Popery, and they act accordingly. They consider Papists as bad members of society, and wish to see them extirpated. They arraign them in much the same terms, and bring them in guilty by much the same proofs, as Dr C——ll; but they seek not, like Dr C——ll, to rescue them from punishment. If they cannot be called merciful, they cannot be said to be unjust. Their zeal is undoubtedly intemperate; but their candour deserves applause. Had they been only at a little more pains to weigh the merits of the cause; had they drawn the character of British Catholics from their own professed principles and practice, instead of forming it out of anonymous libels, slanderous pamphlets, and the misrepresented facts of former times; had they attacked the reality of Popery, and not its phantom; their attacks had been generous, and their views commendable.

In truth, the great fault of almost all those who have of late laboured to expose the doctrines of Roman Catholics is, that they either are, or affect to be, unacquainted with them. The tenets which they themselves profess to hold, and the tenets which they are said to hold by their adversaries, are as different almost as light and darkness. Every moderate Protestant will agree with me that this is unfair. Every moderate

rate Protestant will allow, that, in order to oppugn Popery in a creditable manner, we must oppugn it such as it is, not such as it is misrepresented by its enemies. May I not flatter myself, that the following abstract of their tenets, taken, not from the mouths of their adversaries, but from their own catechisms and books of general instruction, will be acceptable to the Protestant reader who wishes to know what Papists really do believe, and would scorn to impute to them what they do not themselves acknowledge?

The Roman Catholics then believe, in the first place, the Bible to be the word of GOD, and are willing to subscribe to every sentence it contains: but the sense of the Bible, in those parts that admit of dispute, they take, not upon their private opinion, but on that of the whole church; which they believe to have been appointed by JESUS CHRIST, as the only sure and infallible judge of controversies in matters of faith; and from whose judgment, consequently, there can be no appeal. They believe that the government of CHRIST'S church was committed to the Apostles, and their successors in the ministry; that is, principally to bishops, under whom are priests, deacons, and other inferior officers: That of all these bishops, the bishop of Rome, or
the

the Pope, has, as the successor of St Peter, a primacy over the rest: That his see is the centre of the Catholic unity; and that all those who are separated from it are to be looked upon as schismatics. But it is no part of their belief, that this same Pope is infallible, or that he may not be controlled by a general council; much less that he can depose kings, free subjects from their oaths of allegiance, or dispense in any case with any part of natural or divine law. As to their other particular tenets in which they differ from Protestants, the chief are these: They believe that bishops are of divine right; that they only can ordain priests and other inferior ministers, and have an exclusive right to give a definitive sentence in general councils:—That it is possible to keep the commandments by the assistance of divine grace, which is never denied to those who seek it as they ought by prayer:—That the sacraments are the external and ordinary means appointed by JESUS CHRIST to confer special graces:—That they are seven in number; namely, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist or Lord's Supper, Penance, Extreme Unction or the anointing the sick with oil, Holy Order, and Matrimony. But though they believe all these sacraments effectual from the institution and promise of GOD, they acknowledge that they

they are beneficial only to the worthy receiver, (contrary to what P—I C—II has insinuated in his Synod Sermon:—That Baptism takes away original sin in children, and actual in grown-up persons, provided they be truly penitent, and firmly resolved not to relapse:—That Confirmation, or the laying on of hands, (which belongs to the office of Bishops), is accompanied with the Holy Ghost, who enters the soul of the worthy receiver, to strengthen and perfect him in faith and virtue:—That in the Lord's Supper is truly and really contained the body and blood of CHRIST, after a manner not to be comprehended by human understanding, under the outward symbols of bread and wine:—That this sacrament is also a sacrifice, commemorative of that which was offered up on the cross for our sins; it being the same *body* that was then *broken*, and the same *blood* that was then *shed*, tho' now broken and shed in an unbloody and mystical manner. This unbloody and mystical sacrifice is what they call *the Mass*.—They believe, that, in order to obtain remission of sins committed after baptism, they must be repented of, and confessed to the ministers of the church, whom CHRIST has (they say) authorised to bind or loose according to the disposition of the penitent: but they do not believe that all the absolutions

tions
ner
that
to th
able
the
over
dispo
that
ed t
fins,
deat
heal
of P
good
the
coup
and
affist
next
and
their
T
unla
pray
and
they
to th
and
belie
wor

tions on earth can free the unrepenting sinner from the smallest guilt.—They believe that the Sacrament of Ordination conveys to the duly disposed a special grace to enable them to perform in a proper manner the great duties of their function, as the overseers of the flock of CHRIST, and the dispensers of his mysteries:—They believe, that the anointing of the sick with oil, joined to prayer, purifies the soul from lesser sins, strengthens it against the attacks of death, or even contributes to restore the health of the body, when that, in the views of Providence, may seem expedient for the good of the soul:—They believe, that in the Sacrament of Matrimony, the married couple, who engage in that state with holy and Christian dispositions, receive grace to assist them in performing the obligations annexed to their condition; to love, cherish, and support one another, and to bring up their children in the fear of God.

They believe, moreover, that it is not unlawful to desire the saints in heaven to pray to God for them; that they may keep and revere their relics and pictures; that they may consecrate churches and chapels to the honour of God in memory of them, and by their appellation: but they do not believe that any veneration, honour, or worship, are their due, but in as far as they

are the servants and friends of God, to whom alone all worship and adoration, properly so termed, are exclusively due.

They believe, that the church has power to grant indulgences; that is, a release of the penitential canons, or of the temporal punishment supposed to be due to sin; but they do not believe that this release can be of any service to the impenitent, much less that it gives leave to commit sin in hopes of forgiveness.—They believe, that sins may be redeemed by fasting, prayer, and alms-deeds, accompanied with contrition and repentance: but they do not believe that the pardon of sin can be bought with money; or that any power on earth can tax sins at certain prices, as has been lately affirmed in a pestiferous pamphlet *.—They believe, that all sins are not equally heinous, nor all deserving of hell; and, in consequence of this, they believe, that there is a purgatory or middle state after death, in which the souls of those who die guiltless of deadly transgressions, but not so perfectly innocent as to enter directly into the kingdom of heaven, are purified for a limited time from those lesser stains, and prepared to enter into those mansions where nothing undefiled can enter: And they believe, that

souls

* Appeal from the Protestant Association.

souls in that purifying state may be benefited by the prayers of their brethren on earth, and of the saints in heaven; but they do not pretend to determine what is the nature of their sufferings, or how far precisely they are assisted by such prayers. In fine, they believe it good and warrantable to make religious vows of poverty, obedience, and celibacy; but they consider them only as Gospel counsels, which any one may follow or not follow as he thinks best, and to which no one is to be obliged but by an act of his own free-will and deliberate determination.

This, as far as I have been able to learn, is a brief, but just summary of the Popish doctrines. If they appear ill-founded to Protestants, as doubtless many of them will, I see no reason why Protestants may not combat them with the weapons of solid reason and sound argumentation: but there can be no excuse for their meanly attacking them with those of misrepresentation and slander. There can be but one fair way of levelling our censures at any religious profession; and that is, by censuring only their clear and acknowledged belief: but if we abuse them for tenets they do not hold, and for maxims which they abhor, such unfair and impotent attacks must necessarily end in our own confusion.

The admirers of Dr C——ll will probably be much offended at some of these observations; but as I am conscious to myself that they are founded on truth and charity, I am determined to let them have their way into the world, whatever may be the judgments that shall be formed of them. By the smiles that wound others I would not wish to be dazzled; and the man that mentions JESUS CHRIST in the manner he does, I will never be ashamed to oppose; nor shall any prior friendship for him ever induce me to dissemble my abhorrence of such doctrine. I am not here acting the apologist of Popery, but of Christianity. I weigh the Papists in the same scale I weigh other sects in; and have written against some of their first clergymen with as much freedom as I now do against him that injures them. Never indeed on the same points; for among R. Catholics I found always the most awful respect for the Scriptures, and the divinity of that SAVIOUR which Dr C——ll so plainly seeks to undermine. And though I found some of them that appeared to me partial in applying certain texts of the Scripture to support the authority of their church, I never met with one of them that censured Protestants upon principles they did not acknowledge,

or

or charged them with doctrines which they neither believed or practised.

Should Dr C——ll be inclined to take any notice of these observations, I would gladly ask him, in the name of all sober and serious Christians, How he could take pleasure in thus injuring an adverse, oppressed party, without any benefit to his own? Surely this is not a *Christian method* to make proselytes; and I fear it will never be a successful one, any more than that of dragooning them to church, as was lately done at Aberdeen, without reprehension from Dr C——ll or any of his brethren; altho' it be well known that the poor Highlanders, to whom this violence was used, had enlisted in the full confidence of being allowed to profess their own religion, and had even assurances given them that this freedom should never be taken from them. Here was a fine field for Dr C——ll to display his eloquence! Here was a fit subject for pulpit invective! And yet, strange to tell! he never raised his voice against so crying an injustice, nor rebuked those who committed it; although, every thing considered, they were far more guilty than the misguided rabble at Edinburgh, which had a little before so vehemently excited his indignation. But it requires more *Christian* courage and resolution to reprove a set of arbitrary

arbitrary officers constraining the consciences of their soldiers, than to declaim against a set of illiberal fanatics pursuing the dictates of mistaken zeal. Yet *Fenelon*, tho' a Papist, did not hesitate on a similar occasion, to tell an absolute Monarch his duty; and would not hear of the least compulsion being used towards the Protestants in his diocese.—But Dr C——It is not a **FENELON!**



F I N I S.

ien-
inst
dic-
tho-
oc-
du-
om-
ants
ot. a